

EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 2, 1947

"TOWN MEETING" MOVES TO TUESDAYS!

8:30 p.m., EDT 7:30 p.m., CDT 8:30 p.m., MST 8:30 p.m., PST

AUGUST 7, 1947

Town Meeting

Illinois U Library

BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

BROADCAST BY STATIONS OF THE AMERICAN BROADCASTING CO.



Is the Two-Party System Failing in America?

Moderator, GEORGE V. DENNY, JR.

Speakers

GEORGE OUTLAND

GOODWIN J. KNIGHT

BARTLEY CRUM

JAMES ROOSEVELT

(See also page 12)

COMING

—August 14, 1947—

Have Women Failed as Homemakers?

—August 21, 1947—

**Are We Giving Our American Indians
a Square Deal?**

Published by THE TOWN HALL, Inc., New York 18, N.Y.

VOLUME 13, NUMBER 15



\$4.50 A YEAR: 10c A COPY



CONTENTS



The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of view presented.

THE BROADCAST OF AUGUST 7:

"Is the Two-Party System Failing in America?"

<i>Mr. DENNY</i>	3
<i>Mr. OUTLAND</i>	5
<i>Governor KNIGHT</i>	7
<i>Mr. CRUM</i>	9
<i>Mr. ROOSEVELT</i>	11
THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN	12
QUESTIONS, PLEASE!	17



THE BROADCAST OF AUGUST 14:

"Have Women Failed as Homemakers?"



The Broadcast of August 7, 1947, originated in the War Memorial Opera House, San Francisco, California, from 8:30 to 9:30 p.m., E.D.T., over the American Broadcasting Company Network.



Town Meeting is published by The Town Hall, Inc., Town Meeting Publication Office: 400 S. Front St., Columbus 15, Ohio. Send Subscriptions and single copy orders to Town Hall, 123 West 43rd St., New York 18, N.Y. Subscription price, \$4.50 a year, 10c a copy. Entered as second-class matter, May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Illinois U Library

Town Meeting



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

GEORGE V. DENNY, JR., MODERATOR



AUGUST 7, 1947

VOL. 13, No. 15

Is the Two-Party System Failing in America?

Announcer:

To welcome America's Town Meeting of the Air to San Francisco, here is His Honor, the Mayor, Mr. Roger Lapham. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Lapham:

It is really a great pleasure to welcome each of you in this great nation-wide Town Meeting audience to the City of San Francisco. I'm speaking on behalf of the *San Francisco Chronicle* under whose auspices the Town Meeting is originating here tonight and for the people of San Francisco who know and recognize the work of Mr. Denny and his associates as an outstanding American institution of which we are all extremely proud.

United Nations, which has been called a town meeting of the world, was born right here in this auditorium. We, of San Francisco, believe in the Town Meeting idea and this great audience is convincing evidence of that belief.

Now, I'm happy to present the president of Town Hall, New York, and moderator and founder of America's Town Meeting of the Air, Mr. George V. Denny, Jr. Mr. Denny. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Good evening, neighbors. We are honored indeed to be with you here in San Francisco, Mayor Lapham, and as special guests of the *San Francisco Chronicle*. The people of San Francisco have always given Town Meeting a warm welcome and we know tonight that thousands of your friends listening across the Nation will be thinking of your magnificent Golden Gate, the beautiful harbor, the lights of your great city from the Top of the Mark and Telegraph Hill.

As they listened eagerly to the conference of the United Nations, they will be listening in the same way tonight to hear what our distinguished speakers are going to

say about the two-party system in America.

Twice in this century, the politicians and statesmen of the world have failed and twice our military men have brought victory out of possible defeat for the democracies. If we are in danger of a third world war tonight, it's not because of any failure on the part of our military men, our scientists, or our producers of goods and services.

What is the responsibility of our statesmen and politicians in the present crisis? Democracies, dictatorships, socialist states, are all on trial at this point in our history. I wonder which will prove the stronger?

The American people have never been more conscious of politics and economics since the early days of our Republic than they are right now. One of the questions they are asking is the one we pose tonight, "Is the Two-Party System Failing in America?"

The average American voter thinks he has very little to say about selecting candidates and determining party platforms. He imagines that this is done by big politicians in smoked-filled rooms but that's because the average voter doesn't take the trouble to attend the various meetings of his party. Those who howl loudest about not having a voice in these matters are usually those who participate least in the affairs of political parties.

We have the two-party system in America largely because enough people have cared enough over the years to work for the thing they believed in within the framework of these two parties and because no group during the past 90 years has been strong enough to successfully challenge the leadership of these two major political parties in national elections.

Now, however, fingers are being pointed at both parties and people are saying that it is a case of tweedledum and tweedledee. They are saying there's too much collaboration between the two major parties.

People will ask Mr. Roosevelt here tonight how his party can embrace two Senators of such opposing views as Senators Byrd and Pepper and expect to have a consistent policy. And they probably want Mr. Crum to explain how Senators Taft and Morse can be expected to agree on an opposing policy.

I have no doubt that each one of them would like to do some trading, but the fact remains that these gentlemen were duly elected by their respective constituents with the endorsement of their respective parties.

The whole country then is asking such questions as this:

Will the Republicans nominate a conservative or a liberal?

Will Truman run for a second term?

Will Wallace stick by the Democratic party if Truman is nominated?

Do we need a third party?

If both parties nominate conservatives, where will the liberals go?

Well, gentlemen, let's talk politics and let's be realistic. Is the two-party system failing in America? Let's start with a man who never pulls his punches, a man who has appeared frequently on Town Meeting, an educator who went to Congress for two terms as a fighting New Dealer from California's 11th District, and who is now chairman of the Policy Committee of the Democratic party of this state—George Outland, formerly of Santa Barbara and now of San Francisco State College. Mr. Outland. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Outland:

Thank you, Mr. Denny. Many years ago a keen critic of our political system declared, "The two great parties exist in America not because there are two sides to every question but because there are two sides to every office—an outside and an inside." In other words, only ins and outs.

To the degree that a party thinks first only of winning and holding office, to the extent that it places power above policy and patronage above service, it is contributing to the breakdown of our two-party system.

Political parties are not — or rather I should say they *should not*—be ends in themselves. They should be the means to the obtaining of ends. When either Republican or the Democratic party considers itself an end and not the means for the achieving of broad, social, and economic goals desired by the American people, it is then contributing toward the failure of the two-party system.

I was not born a Democrat. I am not a Democrat because my grandfather was. I am a Democrat because in 1933 I saw an American President and his party come forth with a New Deal for the American people. (*Applause.*) I heard him promise more than "prosperity is just around the corner" as the antidote to the most serious depression that our Nation has ever suffered, and I saw those promises kept.

I saw a clean-cut division between one political party that did nothing, that even opposed federal expenditures for starving people, and a party that met depression with work projects, funds for food, and a broad plan for the conservation of America's natural and human resources. Since that time I have been a Democrat, a New Deal Democrat. In my vocabulary there is no other kind. (*Applause.*)

In 1908, the great English student of American government, Lord Bryce, stated that the two

great political parties were like two bottles. Each bore a label denoting the kind of liquor it contained but each was empty. I contend that it is the solemn responsibility of each political party to state clearly and frankly the kind of policies that are contained within its political bottle. I mean a forthright statement on the important issues of the day which will let the American people know exactly what they may expect. I contend that it is the responsibility of candidates then to live up to the stated pledges of their party or go elsewhere.

To the extent that party platforms are vague and indefinite, to the degree that party pledges are broken, to the extent that the voter has no clear-cut choice between men running for public office, then I say the two-party system breaks down.

The Democratic party in California recently has announced its stand on certain vital issues within this state. It has gone on record advocating public distribution of hydro-electric power developed in the Central Valley and for the retention of the 160-acre limitation of farms for water developed there by public funds. The people of California have the right to know just where the Republican party stands on these same issues.

The Democratic party has come out squarely for a 75 cent minimum wage law, for permanent

nursery schools, for special re- control legislation, to mention only a few points. The people of the state should have the right to know where the Republican party—not only the Governor, but also the Lieutenant Governor who is with us tonight, and the Republican Assembly stand on these same issues. (*Applause.*)

Nationally the same situation prevails. Where does each party stand on the Wagner-Elender-Taft housing bill to provide decent homes for our veterans? Having seen who it was that scuttled this measure in the last session of Congress, I think I know the answer, but the entire Nation should know.

Both parties woo labor but the reactionary elements within each combine to override the President's veto of the vicious Taft-Hartley Bill. Such unholy alliances indicate our two-party system breaking down in some respects.

Let me be very clear about one point—I am not advocating a third party. Third party movements, such, have never succeeded in this country. I deplore the tendency of certain well meaning persons who would start a third party to weld together the liberals of the Nation. Instead, I say, let us continue to make the Democratic party the truly liberal party which it became under Franklin Roosevelt. (*Applause.*)

Let those who believe in pla

ning for progress join our ranks. We welcome them. Let those Democrats who prefer the way of reaction and isolation join the opposition. That, too, will be welcome.

When the time comes that the people of America know exactly where each of its two major parties stand, when candidates will be bound to honor party pledges, when patronage and power will have been subordinated to service for the American people, then and then only, will our two-party system live up to the great promise which it contains. Then and then only, will true political democracy be realized in these United States. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, George Outland. Now I think it's time we heard very quickly from the Lieutenant Governor of the State of California, a distinguished Republican who strongly opposes Mr. Outland's views politically and who will undoubtedly take issue with a number of points raised by him here tonight. Governor Knight served for ten years as a judge in the Los Angeles Superior Court until his genial personality and interest in people brought him into the spotlight of the political arena of this great state. I am happy to present the Honorable Goodwin J. Knight, Lieutenant Governor of California. (*Applause.*)

Lieutenant Governor Knight:

Thank you, very much, Mr. Outland. I have enjoyed listening to your very fervent New Deal speech which I claim was your complete right to make here today. Apparently, ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Outland believes that the two-party system was working successfully in 1932 when the people turned the Republicans out, but now feels that it is failing since last year the people brought the Republicans back in. (*Applause.*)

Last fall, in the elections, the Republican party stated its position on the vital issues of the day. The people liked those statements and elected a Senate and a House of Representatives and, in fact, the Democrats liked them so well that here in California they nominated the Republican candidate for Governor, Earl Warren, and overwhelmingly elected him. (*Applause.*)

Since then the California Legislature has passed nearly a thousand laws which the Governor has signed and our party's record, therefore, is unmistakably written so all may read.

I was interested also in hearing Mr. Outland say that in his vocabulary the only Democrat was a New Deal Democrat so I wonder if Mr. Outland is seriously reading out of his party the Jeffersonian Democrats.

Ever since 1856, ninety-one years, there have been two major

political parties in the United States. In 1944, 25 million citizens voted for the candidate of the Democratic party and 22 million favored the Republican standard bearer.

Intense personal loyalty to their political group is one of our American characteristics, and one I like. I concede it is sometimes overdone, however, as when the lawyer in Minneapolis wrote to his friend down in New Orleans and asked what chance there would be for a good lawyer in New Orleans who was a Republican. This friend wired back quickly and said, "As a good lawyer down in New Orleans you will be welcome and as a Republican we will arrange for your protection under the game laws." (*Laughter.*)

But the vitality of the two-party system is more than an emotion. You remember from history or your own experience the failure of third party attempts. The great Theodore Roosevelt founded the Bull Moose party in 1912. It survived only one national campaign. The strenuous efforts of the Progressive party under Bob LaFollette in 1924 met a similar fate. In the last century, the Populist party, the Free-Silver party, the Greenback party, and some others were largely protest efforts which failed and merged their issues with one or the other of the dominant groups.

In the third party movement I

have mentioned, there was strong third party leadership and real membership of millions of voters trying to prove that the two party system was wrong, not by debate as we are indulging in today but by strenuous and tremendous political movements.

The two-party system has survived and justified its survival in the United States because it has been an effective vehicle for translating the will of the people into action through governmental practices and policies.

During the prolonged and unprecedented ascendancy of the Franklin Roosevelt administration in Washington, many thoughtful Americans in both major parties seriously feared we were in danger of a one-party system in this country.

Events, subsequent to the death of President Roosevelt, have proved them to be wrong. Both major parties are today strong, aggressive, and distinctive.

Under our two-party system the people in due course can choose both the type of personal leadership and the organized political agency most responsive to their needs and aspirations.

Far from being a failure, our system is today more vital and just as useful as at any time in our history. We know that if the desires of our citizens are to be made effective, we must have political parties. What kind a

how many? Not the one-party system of Nazi Germany, of Russia, of Franco's Spain. I know Mr. Outland and Mr. Crum will reject that system. Not the many-party methods of France, with their confusion. Today there are 45 newspapers published in Rome and they each represent a separate political party and reflect Italy's confusion and futility.

The recent talk of a third party in 1948 in this country may develop, but it is doomed to failure before it starts. This event, this third party event, is no evidence of weakness in the two-party system and as we look at it objectively it represents a family quarrel largely inspired by personal rivalry.

Today our two-party system reflects the divergent views of our people. These will be crystalized in clear issues for the coming national elections. Witness that in the last Congress the President as the leader of one party opposed the Taft-Hartley Labor Bill, the tax-reduction program, supported the budget, and favored socialized medicine.

The other party, the Republicans, opposed the President. The President did not prevail in his tax veto alone; his party leaders, including the old-time Jeffersonian Democrats, helped him.

Ladies and gentlemen, the two-party system is a great voluntary institution. It is functioning in a

world where the Four Freedoms have become a hollow mockery and tyrants and sawdust Caesars are still beating up little people all over the world because they dare to hope for the kind of freedom you and I enjoy. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Governor Knight. Tonight's discussion is not exactly a debate so I suppose it's permissible for members of the same party to disagree. Now we are going to hear from another distinguished Republican from this state who was active in Wendell Willkie's 1940 campaign, and who was brash enough at one time to head an organization called "Independent Republicans for Roosevelt." More recently, he has been in the news as the author of a book called *Behind the Silken Curtain*, a report on Palestine. I am happy to present a life-long member of the Republican party, Mr. Bartley Crum of San Francisco. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Crum:

Thank you, Mr. Denny, for your very generous introduction. I believe that the people of the United States want our opinions on this subject and I intend to express mine with candor.

Mr. Outland has already sketched for us the background for tonight's discussion—the birth and maturity of the two-party system as we know it in America.

As I see it, the brutal fact is that, in America, the two-party system is failing, after more than a century of successful operation. (*Applause.*)

In spite of the eloquent remarks of my friend, Lieutenant Governor Goodwin Knight, I don't believe that the average American citizen could tell you the difference between a Republican and a Democrat today. (*Applause.*)

To paraphrase a very famous statement of ex-President Hoover, it seems to me that both parties in America today want to stand for two positions on every subject and have a Communist in every pot. (*Laughter.*)

We have not had the two-party system working successfully in America since 1932, I believe, largely due to the political genius of Franklin D. Roosevelt. He was able to hold together, through that genius, in the Democratic party, forces that are really irreconcilable, namely, the southern group of Reactionary Democrats, the largely northern New Dealers, organized labor, and the big bosses, such as Hague, Boss Flynn, and Boss Pendergast. With his death, it has become increasingly apparent to all of us that both parties are today controlled by extremely conservative men, and they are not likely, in my judgment, to lose that control soon.

One example, by way of introduction, will suffice. We have in

America what is known as a bipartisan foreign policy which means, as I understand it, that both major parties agree on the foreign policy of this country. That allows for very little difference of opinion.

Actually, on the Greek-Turkish loan, the two major opponents were Senator Pepper of Florida, a Democrat, and Senator Glenn Taylor of Idaho, likewise a Democrat.

On the Hartley-Taft Labor Bill to use another example, the individual who did most to oppose that bill was a Republican, Senator Wayne Morse of Oregon. (*Applause.*)

Thus, as of today, we find effective opposition comes from fringe groups in both parties. I am in complete agreement with Mr. O'Connell in opposition to a movement for a third party. The task before us is to lift our parties above the level of political booty, to make them once more what Mr. O'Connell describes as instruments to attain desirable ends. (*Applause.*) But this is no easy task.

On the other hand, the political history of our country shows that where political parties fail to meet contemporary needs in contemporary terms, they die, and a new party arises. Naturally, as a Republican, I would like to see my party become the instrument of the twin American concepts of freedom and of progress, just

Mr. Outland and Mr. Roosevelt would like to see theirs become the same thing.

Two things seem very clear to me—first, that the two-party system as such, with each of them trying to be all things to all men is not successful, and second, unless one of the major parties measures up to the responsibility of our times, the result of a failure so to do can only mean that a new party to take its place will be born. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Mr. Crum. Well, it's been a long time since you, our listeners, have heard our next speaker on Town Meeting, and we're very glad to welcome him back to this platform. Since he spoke to us he has helped to fight a war, moved to California, and, as was natural, became active in state politics. He's in the middle of his two-year term as chairman of the Democratic State Central Committee, a job almost as difficult as that of a Town Meeting moderator. But the eldest son of our late President takes to politics like a duck to water. Well, Jimmy, what do you think of the comments of your associates on tonight's discussion? Ladies and gentlemen, Mr. James Roosevelt of Beverly Hills, California. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Roosevelt:

Thank you, Mr. Denny. The opportunity of joining in your

effective contribution to free speech and realistic democracy is an appreciated privilege. Mr. Outland, Lieutenant Governor Knight, and Mr. Crum all join in opposing a third party, so that makes it unanimous here tonight.

Mr. Outland and Mr. Crum have emphasized that in both the Republican and Democratic party improvements are desirable. Now, Governor Knight and I will agree in principle, but differ very much on the desired improvements.

The great majority have followed the advice given by that pioneer, Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, when she said, "There are two kinds of partisanship. One is the kind that reasons out that a certain platform has more things in it that you endorse than the other, and that that party has more possibilities of putting those things into practice than any other. 'Therefore,' you say, 'I will enroll with that party!'"

Therefore, a great majority of Americans today enroll either as Democrats or Republicans and it is a fact that we do have today a two-party system.

Now it is logical for you and Mr. Crum to want to know why, then, does a majority of the Democratic membership in the House and Senate vote with the Republicans for a Taft-Hartley bill and for Republican tax legislation?

Does this not prove that the Republican and Democratic voters

differ very little in aims and principles? The answer is a very strong no.

Gentlemen such as Senator Bilbo — gentlemen, I said — and Congressman Rankin do not re-

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

GEORGE E. OUTLAND—George Outland was born in Santa Paula, California, in 1906. He received an A.B. degree from Whittier College, an M.A. from Harvard, and a Ph.D. degree in education in government from Yale. He also attended the University of Southern California. From 1928 to 1930, Mr. Outland was assistant director of boys' work at Hale House in Boston, and from 1929 to 1933, director of boys' work at Denison House in the same city. Back in California, he directed Neighborhood House in Los Angeles for a year and was supervisor of boys' welfare for the Federal Transient Service of Southern California for another year. Returning East, he became an instructor at Yale and also director of the New Haven (Connecticut) Community College. From 1937 to 1942, Mr. Outland was on the faculty of Santa Barbara (Calif.) State College. In November, 1942, he was elected Democratic Representative to Congress and was reelected in November, 1944. He was defeated in 1946.

Since February, 1947, Mr. Outland has been a professor of social science at San Francisco State College. He is chairman of the California Democratic Party Policy Committee.

BARTLEY CRUM—Born in San Francisco, California, in 1900, Bartley Crum received his A.B. and J.D. degrees from the University of California. In 1924, he began the practice of law in San Francisco. From 1924 to 1932, Mr. Crum was an instructor of international law in the Extension Division of the University of California. He served as California chairman of United China Relief, and was adviser to Wendell L. Willkie during the presidential campaign of 1940. He has been chairman of the Independent Republicans for Roosevelt National Committee, consultant to United Nations Conference at San Francisco, and member of the Anglo-American Committee on Inquiry on Palestine.

Mr. Crum is a contributor to the *New York Times Magazine*, *Christian Science Monitor Magazine*, *The Nation*, *California Law Review*, and other publications. He is also the author of *Behind the Silken Curtain*.

JAMES ROOSEVELT — James Roosevelt, eldest son of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt was born in 1907 in New York City. He is a graduate of Groton and Harvard. He studied law for one year at Boston University and then en-

tered the insurance business. In 1936, James Roosevelt was named administrative assistant to the President and full secretary in 1937. In 1938, he joined the Samuel Goldwyn Productions in Hollywood as a producer.

When the war loomed, James Roosevelt resigned his reserve commission as lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps and later going into active service as a Marine captain. In 1941, he was attached to the British Army in Egypt as an observer, later being assigned to the staff of Colonel William Donovan, then Coordinator of Information. At the time of Pearl Harbor, he went into combat duty in the Marine Corps. In August, 1945, after five years of military service, much of it in the Pacific Theatre of war, he was released from active duty.

Actively interested in politics and public affairs, James Roosevelt campaigned for Al Smith and for his father. He was one of the first officers of the Young Democratic Clubs of America. He has refused nomination to various political career jobs. In July, 1946, he was elected chairman of the Democratic State Central Committee of California.

GOODWIN J. KNIGHT—Republican Lieutenant Governor of California, Goodwin J. Knight was born in Provo, Utah, in 1895. In 1904 his family moved to Los Angeles. Mr. Knight's course at Stanford University was interrupted by World War I. After 19 months in the U. S. Navy, he was discharged as a Seaman Second Class. Returning to Stanford, Mr. Knight was graduated in June, 1919. He was awarded a scholarship which granted him an additional year of residence graduate study at Cornell University in New York.

In 1920, Mr. Knight began to practice law in Los Angeles. In 1933, he became interested in mining and purchased the Elephant Eagle mine on Soledad Mountain in Kern County, California. He built a gold mill and a small town near the mine. As a mine operator he introduced a model plan of labor relations. He understood the problems of the hard-rock miners from first hand experience gained during a year of working in the mines himself while earning money for his college tuition.

In 1935, he was appointed Judge of the Superior Court in Los Angeles. He was elected to the position in 1936 and reelected in 1942, but in 1946, he was elected Lieutenant Governor.

resent the majority opinion of the Democratic party any more than Republicans such as Senator Morse and Bartley Crum are representative of the majority opinion of the Republican party. (*Applause.*)

Senator Taft and Governor Dewey wouldn't have either of these last two gentlemen in the Republican party if they could help it. (*Laughter.*) We would welcome them into the Democratic party anytime. (*Applause.*)

Remember, the majority of the Democratic party is only represented by a handful in the present Congress. Mr. Outland, as an ex-Congressman since 1946, will testify to that.

But you say, "What about foreign affairs?" During and immediately after the war, both major political parties did agree on a united American foreign policy. But again, in my humble opinion, that is only a passing phase.

Senator Taft, in his speech of a few days ago in Ohio, made it absolutely clear that he didn't think much of President Truman's foreign policy, and I hope that President Truman soon will make it clear that he doesn't think much of Senator Taft's policy. (*Laughter.*)

Lieutenant Governor Knight has covered the history of third parties. In each case, they died quickly for the simple reason that most Americans desire to join that party that

has more things in it that they want than any other. A strong third party only results in splitting one of the others.

The Bull Moose party split the Republican party in 1912, and helped the Democrats to win. A Wallace-led third party in 1948 would split the Democratic party and let the conservative Republicans win.

Speaking for the Democratic party, the door is always open for honest differences of opinion. For my book, Mr. Wallace's frank discussions have given expression to the large group of Democrats who still want to work for One World and, therefore, in my opinion, help to steer our national leadership towards the Marshall plan.

The Republican party has proved, in the recent sessions of Congress that it is still the party of conservative—yes, reactionary—retrenchment. Governor Knight and Mr. Outland have emphasized the basic differences between Democrats and Republicans, and Mr. Knight certainly is not for the things that the Democrats of California are for. As late as 1944, Mr. Crum himself found these differences to be so great that he, a Republican, became chairman of the Republicans for Roosevelt.

No, as of today, the two-party system is not failing. The Democrats have a splendid chance to improve our party, by enlisting those thousands of war veterans

who came back to civilian life determined to actively make democracy work and to remove the basic causes of war.

Both parties have a wonderful opportunity to make politics a serious activity for all citizens. Only if we fail to do so in the years ahead, will the two-party system fail, and we must not let it fail. We are all agreed to that on this platform, because there is no other alternative for America. Thank you, very much. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Mr. Roosevelt. Now this is a fine California audience—I was about to say San Francisco audience, but I found out just before we went on the air that about half of them are from San Francisco and the other half from the environs of this great city. They seem to be hanging from the rafters both upstairs and downstairs so we want to get to the question period as soon as we can. In the meantime, will you gentlemen join me up here around the microphone for a few brief, sharp exchanges. I know George Outland and the Governor here want some words before this microphone. George, come along.

Mr. Outland: I'd like to ask the Governor a question. In view of all those many thousands of bills passed by the legislature which were supposed to clarify the Republican position in this state, I

assume you would have no hesitancy in telling this audience where you stand on such issues as Central Valley public power, etc., but more important, I assume that you would be glad to join me in working for a petition for abolition of cross-filing in this state.

Governor Knight: I certainly would.

Mr. Outland: Good.

Governor Knight: But more than that, may I say to you, Mr. Outland, that I am very much puzzled here this afternoon for this very simple reason. Mr. Roosevelt just said that he was sure that the Democrats of California would not be interested in the same things and espouse the same things that I do. Now there are 900,000 more Democrats. Mr. Roosevelt, in California, there are Republicans, and yet, the Republicans and the Democrats elected me to office last November. Can you explain that?

Mr. Roosevelt: Yes, I think so, Governor Knight. In the last election, as you very properly stated, the Republicans made a lot of promises to the people of California, and also to the people of the Nation. For instance, we got rid of OPA, all the prices were coming down. (*Applause.*) If we elected a Republican Congress, and a Republican Lieutenant Governor, etc., we would get lots of houses built. Well, they were very good phrases, but we didn't

get any action, so I am afraid you fooled them, but I don't think you will fool them again. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Mr. Crum?

Mr. Crum: Colonel Roosevelt made reference to the fact that I had supported his father in 1944. I did indeed, and with pleasure, because I believed then that the policies embraced by his father were those which would lead to permanent world peace. I would like to ask Colonel Roosevelt if he thinks the Truman Doctrine was what I voted for. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Roosevelt: No, I don't, and frankly, I think that the Truman Doctrine — the original Truman Doctrine—has been replaced by the Marshall Plan. Would you be opposed to that, Mr. Crum?

Mr. Crum: Certainly not, if it means economic aid to all countries, which I assume it does. (*Applause.*) I think we're all behind it on that basis. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Governor Knight, please.

Governor Knight: Can either Mr. Outland or Colonel Roosevelt explain to me how it happens that with the 900-odd laws that the California Legislature passed in the last six-months session that no newspaper, no group, no society, has petitioned the Governor for any redress or for the legislature, and that you have never heard anybody yet in California say that

they think Earl Warren's done a fine job?

Mr. Denny: Do you fellow's want to match for that answer? Oh, Mr. Outland is closest.

Mr. Outland: May I comment on that? Governor Knight, a week ago in Los Angeles, the Democratic State Committee of this State adopted a resolution to petition the Governor of California to call a special session on rent control in in view of the fact that the Republican-dominated Congress has practically killed rent control. I hope that you will join with us in getting it. (*Applause.*)

Governor Knight: I must say to you, Mr. Outland, in answer, that your President, and I assume you are a Truman Democrat, or perhaps you are a Roosevelt, or maybe you are a Wallace Democrat, but in any event, it was President Truman's plan for rent control that he asked the State Governors to put into effect and Earl Warren is doing that right now. What the Democratic State Central Committee does in Los Angeles with two or three hundred people doesn't represent the people of California. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Governor. Mr. Roosevelt.

Mr. Roosevelt: I'm afraid the implication by Governor Knight was that the rent control law was really President Truman's plan, but he forgot to say that the Republicans, with a little trickery,

put it on his desk at such a late date that if he hadn't signed it, it meant we would have no rent control at all, so as he told the Congress he took it very reluctantly, and I am sick of that kind of trickery. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Governor Knight?

Governor Knight: Surely, Colonel Roosevelt, you aren't now accusing Republicans of political trickery after 14 years of broken promises. Certainly you don't do that! (*Boos and applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Who says that the two-party system is failing? Step up, Mr. Outland.

Mr. Outland: Governor Knight, in all the history of Presidencies of the United States, there were never as many promises fulfilled, and there was never so much achieved in the interest of the common man in America, as there was from 1932 down to right now. (*Applause and cheers.*)

My point is that I am anxious to see each political party come out clearly and tell the American people where it stands from now on. If a party wants to kill price control, then say so. If a party wants to refrain from permitting a decent housing bill to go through, let's say so. Let's not promise we're going to do it, and then knife it in the back. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, gentlemen. Now, we're going to let the audience in on this while it's

going good. Now while we get ready for our question period, I am sure that you, our listeners, will be interested in the following message.

Announcer: Tonight, friends, you are listening to America's Town Meeting of the Air, originating in San Francisco, California, in the beautiful War Memorial Opera House, where we are discussing the question, "Is the Two-Party System Failing in America?"

We are about to begin our question period when George Outland, Bartley Crum, Goodwin J. Knight and James Roosevelt will answer questions put to them by this representative San Francisco audience.

It is part of the Town Hall plan to have these Town Meeting programs originate approximately half the time each year in different cities throughout the country so that we may have truly American audiences. We are now on our Western tour, and will originate programs during the next two months in Santa Barbara, Phoenix, Los Angeles, San Diego, Santa Fe, Albuquerque, Dallas, and Kansas City, returning to Town Hall, New York, October 7.

For your convenience, copies of tonight's broadcast, including the questions and answers to follow, will be printed in our Town Meeting Bulletin, which you may secure by sending 10 cents to Town Hall, New York 18, New York, to cover the cost of printing and mailing.

QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

Mr. Denny: Now then, everyone in tonight's fine San Francisco audience is eligible to win a \$210 set of *Encyclopedia Americana*. If you limit your question to 25 words and our local committee of judges considers it best for bringing out facts and broadening the scope of our discussion, a set of *Encyclopedia Americana* will be yours. We will start with the gentleman here on the third row. Yes, sir.

Man: My question is addressed to James Roosevelt. Mr. Roosevelt, in view of labor strength in the United States within the last 50 years, how is it that labor has not been able to organize a labor party in order to challenge both the Democratic and Republican parties?

Mr. Roosevelt: I think the answer to your question is that it is simply due to the fact that, in recent years at least, the Democratic party has represented the cause of labor—organized and unorganized, and therefore, has not made it necessary for labor to have its own party.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The gentleman over on the other side of the house.

Man: My question is directed to Mr. Crum. In what way can either party control the ideals of their platforms with their chosen candidates?

Mr. Crum: I don't think I quite understand the question.

Man: In what way can either party control the ideals of their platforms with their chosen candidates?

Mr. Crum: Well, if I understand your question correctly, you're asking me what the people should do when a given political party fails to carry out its pledge. The answer to that is to throw them out of office the next time you get a chance. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Mr. Outland wants to comment.

Mr. Outland: I'd like to comment briefly on that question, too, in view of the fact that Lieutenant Governor Knight mentioned something about my wanting to read Jeffersonian Democrats out of the party. And that is simply this, sir, I should say that a candidate for public office, if he is a representative of the Democratic Party, or if he is a representative of the Republican Party, has the responsibility to live up to the greater portion of the pledges made by that party. Now, if he doesn't do it, you're certainly not going to run him out of the party. I would assume, however, that the people of the Nation, seeing that that individual had repudiated the stated pledge of his party would see he was not returned to office next election. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The gentleman down here.

Man: I am addressing my question to Lieutenant Governor Knight. Give me one reason behind your positive statement that a third party is doomed before it starts. Are you afraid of a third party?

Governor Knight: As a Republican, I would welcome a third party being formed in this country in 1948. (*Laughter.*) I can't think of anything, sir, that would be finer to insure the election of a Republican President. But my reason for stating what I did was that the history of all third-party movements in this country has been failure.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The gentleman in the box, there.

Man: In view of the cross-filing system permitted in some of our states and our bi-partisan foreign policy, can you define any difference between our two parties?

Mr. Denny: That was to Mr. Outland.

Mr. Outland: Well, I would say, in the first place, that California is the only state in the union that does have a full-pledged cross-filing system. Other states have things that approximate rather closely—for example, Washington, or Wisconsin, have systems that are somewhat similar but are not the same as ours.

My point is that in California you are never going to have a

truly two-party system as we know that term until you abolish cross-filing. I am very glad to hear the Lieutenant Governor say tonight that he is willing to join with the rest of us in helping to abolish it. I only hope that the rest of the Republican leadership take the same position that he does. If so, we'll then get some place with a two-party system in this state.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The lady in the center of the hall.

Lady: I would like to ask Mr. Crum if, in paraphrasing on great America, he feels that the loyal Americans of the two parties really would desire "a Communism in their pot?"

Mr. Crum: Yes, I was paraphrasing a phrase which was attributed to Mr. Hoover, in which he said that there would be "two cars in every garage and a chicken in every pot." The point I endeavored to make was that, as I view it, as of today, there is no difference basically between the Republican party and the Democratic party. Both of them, in my opinion, being controlled topside by extremely conservative forces.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The gentleman over here.

Man: My question is directed to Mr. Roosevelt, and I'd also like to hear Mr. Outland comment on this. With both Democratic and Republican parties representing the capitalist class interests, how will

the working class get representation without a third party? (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Aren't we all capitalists?

Mr. Roosevelt: Mr. Denny, I agree with you. I think that the thing we should all strive for is to make every American a capitalist. In other words, what we should strive to do is to make democracy work and abolish the class system such as you have just mentioned. If we do a proper job and get people interested in politics and working, such as you good people are doing here today, we can do it with the two-party system. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Outland: As long as the question included me, I would like also to comment on it briefly, if I might. The Democratic party of this state, in its platform declaration made a week ago last Saturday, came out flat-footedly for minimum wage legislation, for decent collective bargaining, for housing, for all of the things that the laboring people in this state need and want. So far as I am concerned, and I am sure that Mr. Roosevelt and a lot of others think the same thing, we are going to continue to try to work to make the Democratic party realize true democracy in America, namely, equality of opportunity for everyone—workingman and everybody else.

Governor Knight: Mr. Denny,

everyone in this country who owns any property or whoever hopes to own any personal or real property is a capitalist. The Republican party has been the champion of free enterprise and freedom of worship, liberty, speech, and of labor. (*Boos.*) Ladies and gentlemen, always remember that the Republican party believes in the free enterprise system and opposes the rigor mortis of the reactionary (*cries of boo and applause*)—the Republican party opposes the rigor mortis of reactionaryism, but let me tell you, the Republican party also opposes the St. Vitus dance of state socialism and communism. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Now let's take a question from the top balcony and the man in the front row. Yes?

Man: Mr. Knight, do you feel that it is right for the citizens to vote for the lesser of two evils because in the past efforts to have third parties failed?

Governor Knight: No, I don't think that anybody should vote for the lesser of two evils, but I say to you this that the history of our country shows that the third party is doomed to failure, and, in 1948, we Republicans are very sorry it will probably repeat.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Now the enthusiastic gentleman in the first balcony.

Man: Mr. Outland, who shall determine which citizen will re-

main in the Democratic party as a liberal and which citizen will be forced out as a reactionary in his relations?

Mr. Outland: I would say in answer to that question, sir, that that is the individual's own choice. However, I do say that it is up to the majority members of the party to state clearly what their platform is. I imagine that a man who were truly a reactionary and truly an isolationist would find himself in much better company if he got out and went into the Republican party. (*Laughter.*)

Mr. Denny: These two Republicans are on their feet.

Governor Knight: I'm happy to say that we welcome every American who believes in the freedom of private enterprise as opposed to socialism and communism. (*Cries of boo.*)

Mr. Crum: I'd like to challenge Mr. Outland's statement on that. It seems to me that there was a gentleman named Willkie who originated the phrase, "one world." (*Applause.*) Secondly, it also seems to me that it was the Democratic administration which initiated unilateral action without consulting the United Nations first. For example, Greece and Turkey. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Mr. Outland?

Mr. Outland: I would say in connection with the latter that it came back to what we called a

few moments ago a bi-partisan foreign policy, Mr. Crum, the same thing that you and I are talking against here when you talk about any unilateral action. I say at the same time that it was the Democratic party under Secretary Marshall that launched the so-called Marshall Plan which is group action and not unilateral action.

I may say one thing further and that is this: I agree with you heartily, sir, that what we want to do is to get one party taking a clear-cut issue on liberal issues and the other taking its stand with the conservatives.

So far as I see it right now, the Democratic party with its weaknesses—and it has them—is in a much better chance to lead the people down the path of liberalism than the Republican party in this Nation is. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The lady in the front row here.

Lady: A question to Mr. Crum. If both parties would talk over differences of objectives for the good of the Nation, wouldn't that clarify for the voters where and how each party stands?

Mr. Crum: I think it would. They would talk their differences over in public.

Mr. Denny: Such as we're doing here tonight. The lady is a good Town Meeting fan.

Mr. Crum: There's no question about that. The trouble is, as today on our bi-partisan foreign

policy, that it's made not in the public gaze at all but behind the scenes. As a matter of fact, the Truman Plan was announced, although it presumably was a bi-partisan plan, I think without even Senator Vandenberg's advance approval. Similarly, I think the record will show that on the Marshall Plan there was no previous discussion and yet we are supposed to have a bi-partisan foreign policy.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Over here in front. Where are you? Wave a handkerchief so I can see you. The gentleman way in the back of the balcony there was shouting. Where are you shouting from? Got a handkerchief? Wave a program, I can't see you. All right. We'll get you next but we'll stop for this man over here. Thank you very much.

Man: Here's another one for you, Bart.

Mr. Denny: Mr. Crum.

Man: Don't you think the fact that so many people can't tell the difference between the Democratic and the Republican party is due to the confusion of the times, and that by trial and error within each party a set of opposing principles will be gradually evolved which will give the public a choice?

Mr. Crum: I certainly hope that that is true, and I believe that if it doesn't happen we're on the road either to fascism or to a multi-party system.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Now the gentleman who was shouting back there. The second balcony in the back. Yes? (*Laughter.*)

Man: My question is to Mr. Roosevelt. (*Confusion.*)

Mr. Denny: Just a minute, just a minute. The man who started with a question for Mr. Roosevelt. Let's have it.

Man: Do you believe that any political party—(*Confusion.*)

Mr. Denny: Now, come, come. I know you're trying to bring about confusion up there. Just let the man finish who started the question for Mr. Roosevelt.

Man: Mr. Roosevelt. Do you believe that any major political party—(*Laughter.*)

Mr. Denny: Quiet, please. Quiet, please. Quiet. Now we'll eliminate you entirely up there if you can't do this in an orderly fashion. All right. Forget it. We'll start down here. I'm sorry, if you can't play fairly you're out of the running. No, you can't. No, sit down. All right. Right here. This lady here. (*Applause.*)

Lady: My question is for Mr. Crum. Would sending more men who are not lawyers to Congress and abolishing the electoral college system give us ordinary citizens a better deal in government?

Mr. Crum: I will answer you this way. I certainly think if we had a Congress and an executive arm, in all governments in the world, made entirely of women,

there would be no further danger of war. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: All right. Mr. Roosevelt.

Mr. Roosevelt: May I say further that I think I, personally, as an individual, would like to see the time come when our candidates for President and Vice President are not nominated by that old system of convention, but are nominated by direct primaries in each of the states of the Union. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Mr. Roosevelt, can you give me any kind of encouragement that we might get the candidates for President and Vice President of the two major parties to talk over the same radio network at the same time, whether it's America's Town Meeting or any other forum?

Mr. Roosevelt: Mr. Denny, you're an old hand in arranging that. I'll be glad to help you if I possibly can. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Good. Were you going to say something, Mr. Crum?

Mr. Crum: Yes, I was just going to say that from what I hear, Jimmy Roosevelt may reverse the field this next time so that you might be able to get them on. (*Laughter and applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Well, I ask that question whenever I can because it's a life-long ambition of Town Meeting to present the candidates for President and Vice President over Town Meeting and we count

on you gentlemen here on the platform and you people out in the country and here in San Francisco to help us realize that objective. The gentleman here. Let's see if we have time for your question.

Man: It seems to me that the people in the Democratic party who supported the reactionary labor law to help kill OPA and who supported the rich man's tax law are the majority of the Democratic party. Are you going to repudiate all those people from the Democratic party?

Mr. Denny: Mr. Outland and I thank you for that comment but now our time is up. While our speakers get ready to prepare their summaries for tonight's question, here's a message of interest to you.

Announcer: Yes, this is a very special message of interest to you. Have you a calendar handy? If you have, will you turn over to the month of September and put a circle around September 2. On September 2, your Town Meeting shifts from Thursday to Tuesday night. Yes, that's right.

Beginning Tuesday, September 2, America's Town Meeting of the Air will be heard regularly on Tuesday nights at the following hours:

8:30 to 9:30 Eastern Time.

7:30 to 8:30 Central Time.

By transcription 8:30 to 9:30 Mountain Time.

8:30 to 9:30 Pacific Time.

The American Broadcasting Company has arranged to bring you your Town Meeting at these convenient hours so that you may listen not only individually but as discussion groups and carry on your discussion at the close of each program. So begin to tell your friends now. Make your plans now to hear your Town Meeting on Tuesday night, beginning on September 2. Remember the date, September 2 moves to Tuesday night. Now for the summaries of tonight's discussion here is Mr. Denny.

Mr. Denny: Let's hear first from Mr. James Roosevelt.

Mr. Roosevelt: Mr. Denny, I feel that we have, tonight, pretty well shown that there is plenty to change in both parties, but that, as of today, there is no question that there is no workable solution—or rather workable alternative—to our American two-party system. Therefore, what we should try to do is to make the Democratic and Republican parties stand for definite things so that we have definite choices between the two. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, James Roosevelt. Mr. Bartley Crum.

Mr. Crum: Mr. Denny, I've heard nothing here tonight which has altered my opinion that the two-party system is failing to meet the needs of our times in contemporary terms.

Like all of my distinguished friends here tonight, I too am strongly in favor of the maintenance of the home and I'm violently against the common cold, but I submit that that is not enough. Either the two-party system will be reinvigorated, or we face the possibility either of one-party government or multi-party government. The first alternative is fascism, the second leads blindly down the path of confusion and chaos. What we must have is a realignment of political forces. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Crum. Now, Lieutenant Governor Goodwin Knight.

Mr. Knight: Thank you, Mr. Denny. The vigor of this debate this evening proves my first contention that the two-party system is still strong and is still representing the people. But may I say I was somewhat surprised to hear in this audience apparently disapproval on the part of so many Californians in the doctrine of free enterprise, freedom of speech, freedom of religion. Apparently, ladies and gentlemen, you do not realize that both the Democratic and Republican party have set those principles as their major cornerstones and we'll always fight for them, regardless of the communists. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Governor Knight. Mr. George Outland.

Mr. Outland: Thank you, Mr. Denny. I think the issues are probably a little sharper than my friend Mr. Crum mentioned when he intimated that we were all against sin. I'm sure we are.

I also think, however, that the task we have ahead of us is the major thing. Not looking backward but looking ahead. For my part, the thing to do is look ahead when each party, Republican and Democrat, comes out with a clear-cut statement of the policy for which it stands, and when the candidates which each party puts up do the same thing. No third party we want, we want two real major parties, and the Democratic one is the liberal one. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, George Outland, Bartley Crum, Goodwin Knight, and James Roosevelt and thanks also to our host, the *San Francisco Chronicle*, and Station KGO for their magnificent cooperation in turning out this fine audience.

If you, our listeners, want a

copy of tonight's program, remember you can secure it by sending 10 cents to Town Hall, New York 18, New York.

Next week we visit Santa Barbara, where we will be the guests of the Lobero Theater Foundation, for an extremely provocative discussion of the question "Have Women Failed as Homemakers?" Our speakers will be Dr. Paul Popenoe, Director of the American Institute of Family Relations; Dr. Katherine Whiteside Taylor, psychologist and specialist in family life education at the University of Illinois; Dr. David Seabury, author, lecturer, and psychologist; and Ruth Hussey, stage, screen, and radio star.

Now our committee of judges is supposed to have the winning question here to announce at this time. They evidently have not reached a decision, so we'll have to award that prize later.

But plan now to be with us next week and every week at the sound of the crier's bell. (*Applause.*)